

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 were rejected under §103 over Mori in view of Nagel. This rejection is moot because claim 4 is not incorporated into claim 1.

Claim 4 was rejected under §103 over Mori in view of Nagel and Nakamura. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Mori discloses a cell phone hooked to a computer, but not a communication card storing protocols for various cell phones. The Examiner relies on Nagel for this feature and asserts (page 3) that Nagel discloses at col. 19, lines 23-30 (first paragraph of claim 9) a communication adaptor card storing plural communication protocols.

Nagel says that it adapts to different cell phones by using software (col. 2, line 62). Nagel discloses identifying a model of cell phone based on its behavior. For example, it can determine if a Nokia phone is present by querying whether a pin is held high (col. 12, lines 25-28). After identification, "reconfiguration is required" for using a different cell phone (col. 12, line 7).

Nagel discloses no switch at all, only software. The applied text of Nagel at col. 19, lines 23-30, does not recite any switch but instead recites "a device-specific *program* control component" (emphasis added). Moreover, it discloses no "connector ... for outputting the identification information." The connector is completely passive and conventional.

The Examiner relies on switch 17 of Nakamura for the subject matter of claim 4. However, switch 17 is a "changeover" switch selecting manual or automatic modes in an answering machine. Nakamura writes, "At the time of the manual mode [which is selected by the switch 17], when a call incoming request is present from the outside line, an operator hooks-off a handset ... speaks with the outside line and transfers the call to a slave station."

The switch of Nakamura is completely unrelated to cell phones, or to adapting to different cell phones. It is only concerned with standard land lines and call routing. As such, it does not teach substituting a switch for the software of Nagel.

With respect, if Nakamura has a power-on switch, it will be no more germane to the cell phone adaptation of Nagel than is the switch 17 that is applied against the claims.

The claimed DIP switches are a distinct improvement over Nagel's software, because they are simpler (the cell phone does not need to be tested by the software) and therefore less likely to fail due to software bugs, and less expensive.

The new claims are patentable by their dependence and for reciting additional subject matter not disclosed by any of the applied references.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



June 7, 2005

Date

Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)

(717) 426-1664

RABIN & BERDO, P.C.

CUSTOMER NO. 23995

Telephone: (202) 371-8976

Telefax : (202) 408-0924